

REMARKS

Careful consideration has been given to the Official Action of April 1, 2005, and reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested:

claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 as being indefinite;

claims 15-17 and 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blidung et al. (US Patent 5,630,309) in view of Draghetti et al. (US Publication 2003/0052020);

claims 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blidung et al. (US Patent 5,630,309) in view of Draghetti et al. (US Publication 2003/0052020) and further in view of Montemayor et al. (US Patent 5,494,398);

claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blidung et al. (US Patent 5,630,309) in view of Draghetti et al. (US Publication 2003/0052020) and further in view of Focke et al. (US Patent 6,722,109);

claims 21-25 are objected to, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

In response, claims 1, 3, 6, 7, 9-15, 17, 18, 21, 22 and 25 have been amended, claims 2 and 16 have been canceled, and new claims 30 and 31 have been added. Accordingly, claims 1, 3-15 and 17-31 are pending in the present application.

It is respectfully submitted that the pending claims are in allowable condition.

Claim 1 has been amended to positively recite a number of method steps and also to include the subject matter of original dependent claim 2.

Claim 15 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of original dependent claim 16.

Claims 1 and 15 recite, in part, that a group of blank are unloaded from a first pallet in a storage area, formed in a succession of individual blanks each of which is processed

individually and is then regrouped to reconstruct the respective group, and finally is loaded onto a new pallet in the same storage area.

Blidung and Draghetti fail to disclose or even suggest forming a group of blanks in a succession of individual blanks each of which is processed individually and is then regrouped to reconstruct the respective group. Blidung discloses the supplying of stacks of blanks to a packing machine and the aim of the invention is a novel method to feed the stacks using two conveyors parallel one to one another; Blidung does not disclose or show the separation of individual blanks from a stack, since Blidung teaches only how to manage complete stacks of blanks. Draghetti does not disclose regrouping the individual blanks to reconstruct the respective group.

Therefore, in order to arrive at the invention as claimed in claims 1 or 15, one would have to completely disregard the teachings given by Blidung (in which the groups of blank are not formed in a succession of individual blanks each of which is processed individually) and by Draghetti (in which the processed individual blanks are not regrouped to reconstruct the respective group). There would be no suggestion to discard these teachings without using applicant's own disclosure as a template, and no such suggestion can be found in the reference in any event. "To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art" MPEP § 2143.03. As stated above, Blidung and Draghetti do not show or suggest forming a group of blank in a succession of individual blanks each of which is processed individually and then regrouping the blanks to reconstruct the respective group. Accordingly, claims 1 and 15 are deemed allowable over the cited references. Claims 3-14 and 17-29 depending from claims 1 and 15 respectively are also allowable therewith.

New claim 30 incorporates the subject matter of original claims 15, 16 and 21, and new claim 31 incorporates the subject matter of original claims 15, 16 and 25. Such subject matter has been indicated as allowable and accordingly, claims 30 and 31 are considered allowable over the cited references.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above action and comments, it is submitted that the claims as now appearing in this application are in good and proper form for allowance. A favorable action on the part of the examiner is respectfully solicited. If, in the opinion of the examiner a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of the subject application, the examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



JULIAN H. COHEN
c/o Ladas & Parry LLP
26 West 61st Street
New York, New York 10023
Reg. No. 20302
Tel. No. (212) 708-1887